arXiv:1209.6169v1 [math.OC] 27 Sep 2012

Stochastic differential game of functional forward-backward stochastic system and related path-dependent HJBI equation

Shaolin Ji[*] Qingmeng Wei[†]

Shandong University Shandong University

Abstract: This paper is devoted to a stochastic differential game of functional forward-backward stochastic differential equation (FBSDE, for short). The associated upper and lower value functions of the stochastic differential game are defined by controlled functional backward stochastic differential equations (BSDEs, for short). Applying the Girsanov transformation method introduced by Buckdahn and Li [1], the upper and the lower value functions are shown to be deterministic. We also generalize the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman-Isaacs (HJBI, for short) equations to the path-dependent ones. By establishing the dynamic programming principal (DPP, for short), the upper and the lower value functions are shown to be the viscosity solutions of the corresponding upper and the lower path-dependent HJBI equations, respectively.

Keywords: Stochastic differential game; Functional forward-backward stochastic differential equation; Path-dependent Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman-Isaacs equation; Dynamic programming principle; Viscosity solution.

1 Introduction

The theory of backward stochastic differential equations (BSDEs, for short) has been studied widely since Pardoux and Peng [14] first introduced the nonlinear BSDEs in 1990. BSDEs have got applications in many fields, such as, stochastic control (see Peng [17]), stochastic differential games (see Hamadene, Lepeltier [10], Hamadene, Lepeltier and Peng [11]), mathematical finance (see El Karoui, Peng and Quenez [12]) and partial differential equation theory (see Peng [18, 19]), etc.

In the aspect of finance, the BSDE theory presents a simple formulation of stochastic differential utilities introduced by Duffie and Epstein [6]. When the generator g of a BSDE does not depend on z, the solution Y is just the recursive utility presented in [6]. From the view of BSDE, by studying some important properties (such as, comparison theorem) of BSDEs, El Karoui, Peng and Quenez [12] gave the more general class of recursive utilities and their properties. And later the recursive optimal control problems whose cost functionals are described by the solution of BSDE are studied widely. Peng [19] obtained the Bellman's dynamic programming principle (DPP) for this kind of problem and proved the

---

[*] Institute for Financial Studies and Institute of Mathematics, Shandong University, Jinan 250100, China. Email: jsl@sdu.edu.cn, Fax: +86 0531 88564100

[†] Institute of Mathematics, Shandong University, Jinan 250100, China. Email: qingmengwei@gmail.com

value function to be a viscosity solution of one kind of quasi-linear second order PDE, i.e., Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman (HJB) equation. Later, for the recursive optimal control problem introduced by a BSDE under Markovian framework, by introducing the notion of backward semigroup of BSDE, in Peng [20], the Bellman's DPP is derived and the value function is proved to be a viscosity solution of a generalized HJB equation.

By now, the DPP with related HJB equation has become a powerful approach to solving optimal control and game problems (see [1] [9], [23], [24]). In [1], Buckdahn and Li studied a recursive stochastic differential game problem and interpreted the relationship between the controlled system and the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman-Isaacs (HJBI, for short) equation. A point is worthy to mention: in order to derive the DPP, they introduced a Girsanov transformation method to prove the value functions are deterministic which is different from the method developed in Peng [20].

There really exist some systems which are modeled only by stochastic systems whose evolutions depend on the past history of the states. Bases on this phenomenon, Ji and Yang [13] investigated a controlled system governed by a functional forward-backward stochastic differential equation (FBSDE, for short) and proved the value function is the viscosity solution of the related path-dependent HJB equation.

In this paper, inspired by [1] and [13], we will investigate the stochastic differential game problems of the functional FBSDEs. Precisely, the dynamics of the stochastic differential games are described by the following functional SDE:

$$\begin{cases} dX^{\gamma_t;u,v}(s) &= b(X_s^{\gamma_t;u,v}, u(s), v(s))ds + \sigma(X_s^{\gamma_t;u,v}, u(s), v(s))dB(s), \quad s \in [t,T], \\ X_t^{\gamma_t,u,v} &= \gamma_t. \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

And the cost functional $J(\gamma_t; u, v)$ is defined as $Y^{\gamma_t;u,v}(t)$ which is the solution of the following functional BSDE:

$$\begin{cases} dY^{\gamma_t;u,v}(s) &= -f(X_s^{\gamma_t;u,v}, Y^{\gamma_t;u,v}(s), Z^{\gamma_t;u,v}(s), u(s), v(s))ds + Z^{\gamma_t;u,v}(s)dB(s), \\ Y^{\gamma_t,u,v}(T) &= \Phi(X_T^{\gamma_t;u,v}), \quad s \in [t,T], \end{cases} \tag{1.2}$$

where γ_t is a path on $[0,t]$. The driver f and Φ can be interpreted as the running cost and the terminal cost, respectively. Also, they depend on the past history of the dynamics. (1.1) and (1.2) compose a decoupled functional FBSDE. The concrete conditions on b, σ, f, Φ are shown in the later section.

In the context, we adopt the strategy against control form. The cost functional $J(\gamma_t; u, v)$ is explained as a payoff for player I and as a cost for player II. The aim of this paper is to show the following lower and upper value functions

$$W(\gamma_t) := \operatorname*{essinf}_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}_{t,T}} \operatorname*{esssup}_{u \in \mathcal{U}_{t,T}} J(\gamma_t; u, \beta(u)), \tag{1.3}$$

$$U(\gamma_t) := \operatorname*{esssup}_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_{t,T}} \operatorname*{essinf}_{v \in \mathcal{V}_{t,T}} J(\gamma_t; \alpha(v), v) \tag{1.4}$$

are the viscosity solutions of the following path-dependent HJBI equations, respectively:

$$\begin{cases} D_t W(\gamma_t) + \sup_{u \in U} \inf_{v \in V} H(\gamma_t, W, D_x W, D_{xx} W, u, v) = 0, \\ W(\gamma_T) = \Phi(\gamma_T), \quad \gamma_T \in \Lambda, \end{cases} \tag{1.5}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} D_t U(\gamma_t) + \inf_{v \in V} \sup_{u \in U} H(\gamma_t, U, D_x U, D_{xx} U, u, v) = 0, \\ U(\gamma_t) = \Phi(\gamma_T), \quad \gamma_T \in \Lambda, \end{cases} \tag{1.6}$$

where

$$H(\gamma_t, y, p, X, u, v) = \frac{1}{2}tr(\sigma\sigma^T(\gamma_t, u, v)X) + p.b(\gamma_t, u, v) + f(\gamma_t, y, p.\sigma(\gamma_t, u, v), u, v),$$

where $(\gamma_t, y, p, X) \in \Lambda \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{S}^d$ ($\mathbb{S}^d$ denotes the set of $d \times d$ symmetric matrices).

To solve the above stochastic differential game problem, we need the functional Itô calculus and path-dependent PDEs which are recently introduced by Dupire [7] (for a recent account of this theory, the reader may consult [2, 3, 4]. And under the framework of functional Itô's calculus, for the non-Markovian BSDEs, Peng and Wang [22] derived a nonlinear Feynman-Kac formula for classical solutions of path-dependent PDEs. For the further development, the readers may refer to [8, 21]).

In this paper, we apply the Girsanov transformation method in Buckdahn and Li [1] to prove the determinacy of the value functions, which is different from the method introduced by Peng [19, 20]. Making use of this method and the functional Itô's calculus (introduced by Dupire [7], and developed by Cont, Fournié [2, 3, 4]), we complete the study of the zero-sum two-player stochastic differential games in the non-Markovian case and present the lower and upper value functions of our stochastic differential game are the viscosity solution of the corresponding path-dependent HJBI equations, respectively.

Different from the HJBI equations derived for stochastic delay systems, we establish the dynamic programming principle and derive the HJBI equation in the new framework of functional Itô calculus.

This paper is organized as follows: Section 2 recalls the functional Itô calculus and the well-known results of BSDEs we will use later. In Section 3, we formulate our stochastic differential games and get the corresponding DPP. Based on the obtained DPP, in Section 4 we derive the main result of the paper: the lower and upper value functions are the viscosity solutions of the associated path-dependent HJBI equations, respectively. And we add the proof for the DPP in the Appendix.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Functional Itô's calculus

We present some preliminaries for functional Itô's calculus introduced firstly by Dupire [7]. Here we follow the notations in [7].

Let $T > 0$ be fixed. For each $t \in [0, T]$, we denote Λ_t the set of càdlàg functions from $[0, t]$ to $\mathbb{R}^d$.

For $\gamma \in \Lambda_T$, denote $\gamma(s)$ by the value of γ at time $s \in [0, T]$. Thus $\gamma = (\gamma(s))_{0\leq s\leq T}$ is a càdlàg process on $[0, T]$ and its value at time s is $\gamma(s)$. $\gamma_t = (\gamma(s))_{0\leq s\leq t} \in \Lambda_t$ is the path of γ up to time t. We denote $\Lambda = \bigcup_{t\in[0,T]} \Lambda_t$. For each $\gamma_t \in \Lambda$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\gamma_t(s)$ is denoted by the value of γ_t at $s \in [0, t]$ and $\gamma_t^x := (\gamma_t(s)_{0\leq s<t}, \gamma_t(t) + x)$ which is also an element in Λ_t.

We now introduce a distance on Λ. Let $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and $|\cdot|$ denote the inner product and norm in $\mathbb{R}^d$. For each $0 \leq t, \bar{t} \leq T$ and $\gamma_t, \gamma_{\bar{t}} \in \Lambda$, we set

$$\|\gamma_t\| := \sup_{s\in[0,t]} |\gamma_t(s)|,$$

$$\|\gamma_t - \bar{\gamma}_{\bar{t}}\| := \sup_{s\in[0,t\vee\bar{t}]} |\gamma_t(s \wedge t) - \bar{\gamma}_{\bar{t}}(s \wedge \bar{t})|,$$

$$d_\infty(\gamma_t, \bar{\gamma}_{\bar{t}}) := \sup_{s\in[0,t\vee\bar{t}]} |\gamma_t(s \wedge t) - \bar{\gamma}_{\bar{t}}(s \wedge \bar{t})| + |t - \bar{t}|.$$

It is obvious that Λ_t is a Banach space with respect to $\|\cdot\|$. Since Λ is not a linear space, d_∞ is not a norm.

Definition 2.1. *A functional $u : \Lambda \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is Λ-continuous at $\gamma_t \in \Lambda$, if for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for each $\bar{\gamma}_{\bar{t}} \in \Lambda$ with $d_\infty(\gamma_t, \bar{\gamma}_{\bar{t}}) < \delta$, we have $|u(\gamma_t) - u(\bar{\gamma}_{\bar{t}})| < \varepsilon$.*

u is said to be Λ-continuous if it is Λ-continuous at each $\gamma_t \in \Lambda$.

Definition 2.2. *Let $v : \Lambda \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ and $\gamma_t \in \Lambda$ be given. If there exists $p \in \mathbb{R}^d$, such that*

$$v(\gamma_t^x) = v(\gamma_t) + \langle p, x\rangle + o(|x|), \text{ as } x \to 0, x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Then we say that v is (vertically) differentiable at t and denote the gradient of $D_x v(\gamma_t) = p$. v is said to be vertically differentiable in Λ, if $D_x v(\gamma_t)$ exists for each $\gamma_t \in \Lambda$. The Hessian $D_{xx} v(\gamma_t)$ can be defined similarly. It is an $S(d)$-valued function defined on Λ, where $S(d)$ is the space of all $d \times d$ symmetric matrices.

For each $\gamma_t \in \Lambda$, we denote $\gamma_{t,s}(r) := \gamma_t(r)1_{[0,t)}(r) + \gamma_t(t)1_{[t,s]}(r),\ r \in [0, s]$. It is clear that $\gamma_{t,s} \in \Lambda_s$.

Definition 2.3. *For a given $\gamma_t \in \Lambda$, if we have*

$$v(\gamma_{t,s}) = v(\gamma_t) + a(s-t) + o(|s-t|), \ \text{ as } s \to t,\ s \geq t,$$

then we say that $v(\gamma_t)$ is (horizontally) differentiable in t at γ_t and denote $D_t v(\gamma_t) = a$. v is said to be horizontally differentiable in Λ if $D_t v(\gamma_t)$ exists for each $\gamma_t \in \Lambda$.

Definition 2.4. *Define $\mathbb{C}^{j,k}(\Lambda)$ as the set of function $v := (v(\gamma_t))_{\gamma_t \in \Lambda}$ defined on Λ which are j times horizontally and k times vertically differentiable in Λ such that all these derivatives are Λ-continuous.*

The following is about the functional Itô's formula which was firstly obtained by Dupire [7] and then developed by Cont and Fournié [4] for a more general formulation.

Theorem 2.1. *(Functional Itô's formula). Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\in[0,T]}, P)$ be a probability space, if X is a continuous semi-martingale and v is in $\mathbb{C}^{1,2}(\Lambda)$, then for any $t \in [0, T)$,*

$$v(X_t) - v(X_0) = \int_0^t D_s v(X_s) ds + \int_0^t D_x v(X_s) dX(s) + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t D_{xx} v(X_s) d\langle X\rangle(s), \ P\text{-a.s.}$$

2.2 BSDEs

In this section, we recollect some important results which will be used in our stochastic differential game problems.

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ be the Wiener space, where Ω is the set of continuous functions from $[0, T]$ to $\mathbb{R}^d$ starting from 0 ($\Omega = C_0([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^d)$), $\mathcal{F}$ is the completed Borel σ-algebra over Ω, and P is the Wiener measure. Let B be the canonical process: $B(\omega, s) = \omega_s, s \in [0, T],\ \omega \in \Omega$. We denote by $\mathbb{F} = \{\mathcal{F}_s,\ 0 \leq s \leq T\}$ the natural filtration generated by $\{B(t)\}_{t\geq 0}$ and augmented by all P-null sets, i.e., $\mathcal{F}_s = \sigma\{B(r), r \leq s\} \vee \mathcal{N}_P,\ s \in [0, T]$; $\mathcal{F}_t^s = \sigma(B(r) - B(t), t \leq r \leq s) \vee \mathcal{N}_P$, where $\mathcal{N}_P$ is the set of all P-null subsets and T is a fixed real time horizon. We introduce the following two spaces of processes which will be used frequently:

$\mathcal{S}^2(0, T; \mathbb{R}^n) := \{(\psi(t))_{0\leq t\leq T}$ $\mathbb{R}^n$-valued $\mathbb{F}$-adapted continuous process :

$$E[\sup_{0\leq t\leq T} |\psi(t)|^2] < +\infty\};$$

$\mathcal{H}^2(0, T; \mathbb{R}^n) := \{(\psi(t))_{0\leq t\leq T}$ $\mathbb{R}^n$-valued $\mathbb{F}$-progressively measurable process :

$$\| \psi \|^2 = E[\textstyle\int_0^T |\psi(t)|^2 dt] < +\infty\}.$$

Now we consider a function $g : \Omega \times [0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$, such that $(g(t, y, z))_{t\in[0,T]}$ is progressively measurable for each (y, z) in $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$, and satisfies the following assumptions throughout the paper:

(**A1**) There exists a constant $C \geq 0$ such that, P-a.s., for all $t \in [0,T]$, $y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{R}$, $z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$|g(t, y_1, z_1) - g(t, y_2, z_2)| \leq C(|y_1 - y_2| + |z_1 - z_2|),$$

(**A2**) $g(\cdot, 0, 0) \in \mathcal{H}^2(0, T; \mathbb{R})$.

The following results on BSDEs are well-known. The readers may refer to Pardoux and Peng [14].

Lemma 2.1. *Under the assumptions* (**A1**) *and* (**A2**)*, for any random variable* $\xi \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_T, P)$*, the BSDE*

$$y(t) = \xi + \int_t^T g(s, y(s), z(s))ds - \int_t^T z(s)\, dB(s),\ 0 \leq t \leq T \tag{2.1}$$

has a unique adapted solution

$$(y(t), z(t))_{t\in[0,T]} \in \mathcal{S}^2(0, T; \mathbb{R}) \times \mathcal{H}^2(0, T; \mathbb{R}^d).$$

In the following, we always suppose the driving coefficient g of a BSDE satisfies (**A1**) and (**A2**).

Lemma 2.2. *(Comparison Theorem) Given two coefficients* g_1, g_2 *satisfying* (**A1**) *and* (**A2**) *and two terminal values* $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_T, P)$*, we denote by* (y^1, z^1) *and* (y^2, z^2) *the solution of a BSDE with the data* (ξ_1, g_1) *and* (ξ_2, g_2)*, respectively. Then we have :*

(i) *If* $\xi_1 \geq \xi_2$ *and* $g_1 \geq g_2$*, P-a.s., then* $y^1(t) \geq y^2(t)$*, P-a.s., for all* $t \in [0,T]$.

(ii) *(Strict monotonicity) If, in addition to (i), we also assume that* $P(\xi_1 > \xi_2) > 0$*, then* $P(y^1(t) > y^2(t)) > 0$, $0 \leq t \leq T$*, and, in particular,* $y^1(0) > y^2(0)$.

With the notations in Lemma 2.2, we assume that, for some $g : \Omega \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying (**A1**) and (**A2**), the drivers g_i have the following form:

$$g_i(s, y^i(s), z^i(s)) = g(s, y^i(s), z^i(s)) + \varphi_i(s), \quad \text{dsdP-a.e.}, \quad i = 1, 2,$$

where $\varphi_i \in \mathcal{H}^2(0, T; \mathbb{R})$. Then, for all terminal values ξ_1, $\xi_2 \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_T, P)$, we have the following results.

Lemma 2.3. *The difference of the solutions* (y^1, z^1) *and* (y^2, z^2) *of BSDE (2.1) with the data* (ξ_1, g_1) *and* (ξ_2, g_2)*, respectively, satisfies the following estimate:*

$$\begin{aligned}
&|y^1(t) - y^2(t)|^2 + \tfrac{1}{2}E[\textstyle\int_t^T e^{\beta(s-t)}(|y^1(s) - y^2(s)|^2 + |z^1(s) - z^2(s)|^2)ds \mid \mathcal{F}_t] \\
&\leq E[e^{\beta(T-t)}|\xi_1 - \xi_2|^2|\mathcal{F}_t] + E[\textstyle\int_t^T e^{\beta(s-t)}|\varphi_1(s) - \varphi_2(s)|^2 ds \mid \mathcal{F}_t],
\end{aligned}$$

P-a.s., for all $0 \leq t \leq T$*, where* $\beta = 16(1 + C^2)$.

Proof. For the proof the reader is referred to Proposition 2.1 in El Karoui, Peng, and Quenez [12] or Theorem 2.3 in Peng [20]. ☐

3 A DPP for Stochastic Differential Games of functional FBSDEs

In this section, we consider the stochastic differential games of functional FBSDEs.

First we introduce the background of stochastic differential games. Suppose that the control state spaces U, V are compact metric spaces. $\mathcal{U}$ (resp., $\mathcal{V}$) is the control set of all U (resp., V)-valued $\mathbb{F}$-progressively measurable processes for the first (resp., second) player. If $u \in \mathcal{U}$ (resp., $v \in \mathcal{V}$), we call u (resp., v) an admissible control.

Let us give the following mappings

$$b : \Lambda \times U \times V \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^n,$$
$$\sigma : \Lambda \times U \times V \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n\times d},$$
$$f : \Lambda \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times U \times V \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}.$$

For given admissible controls $u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}$, $v(\cdot) \in \mathcal{V}$, and $t \in [0,T]$, $\gamma_t \in \Lambda$, we consider the following functional forward-backward stochastic system

$$\begin{cases} dX^{\gamma_t;u,v}(s) &= b(X_s^{\gamma_t;u,v}, u(s), v(s))ds + \sigma(X_s^{\gamma_t;u,v}, u(s), v(s))dB(s), \quad s \in [t,T], \\ dY^{\gamma_t;u,v}(s) &= -f(X_s^{\gamma_t;u,v}, Y^{\gamma_t;u,v}(s), Z^{\gamma_t;u,v}(s), u(s), v(s))ds + Z^{\gamma_t;u,v}(s)dB(s), \\ X_t^{\gamma_t,u,v} &= \gamma_t, \\ Y^{\gamma_t,u,v}(T) &= \Phi(X_T^{\gamma_t;u,v}), \end{cases} \tag{3.1}$$

Now, we present the assumptions to ensure the existence and uniqueness of the solution of functional FBSDEs (3.1).

(**H**) (i) For all $t \in [0,T]$, $u \in U$, $v \in V$, $x_t \in \Lambda$, $y \in \mathbb{R}$, $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $b(x_t,u,v)$, $\sigma(x_t,u,v)$, and $f(x_t,y,z,u,v)$ are $\mathcal{F}_t$-measurable.

(ii) There exists a constant $C > 0$, such that, for all $t \in [0,T]$, $u \in U$, $v \in V$, for any $x_t^1, x_t^2 \in \Lambda$,

$$|b(x_t^1,u,v) - b(x_t^2,u,v)| \le C \parallel x_t^1 - x_t^2 \parallel;$$
$$|b(x_t,u,v)| \le C(1+ \parallel x_t \parallel), \text{ for any } x_t \in \Lambda.$$

(iii) There exists a constant $C > 0$, such that for all $t \in [0,T]$, $u \in U$, $v \in V$, for any $x_t^1, x_t^2 \in \Lambda$, $y^1, y^2 \in \mathbb{R}$, $z^1, z^2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$|f(x_t^1,y^1,z^1,u,v) - f(x_t^2,y^2,z^2,u,v)| \le C(\parallel x_t^1 - x_t^2 \parallel + |y^1 - y^2| + |z^1 - z^2|);$$
$$|\Phi(x_T^1) - \Phi(x_T^2)| \le C \parallel x_T^1 - x_T^2 \parallel;$$

and

$$|f(x_t,0,0,u,v)| \le C(1+ \parallel x_t \parallel);$$
$$|\Phi(x_T)| \le C(1+ \parallel x_T \parallel), \text{ for any } x_t \in \Lambda.$$

Theorem 3.1. *Under the assumption* (**H**)*, there exists a unique solution* $(X,Y,Z) \in \mathcal{S}^2(0,T;\mathbb{R}^n) \times \mathcal{S}^2(0,T;\mathbb{R}) \times \mathcal{H}^2(0,T;\mathbb{R}^d)$ *solving (3.1).*

We introduce the subspaces of admissible controls and the definitions of admissible strategies, which are similar to [1].

Definition 3.1. *An admissible control process* $u = (u_r)_{r\in[t,s]}$ *(resp.,* $v = (v_r)_{r\in[t,s]}$*) for Player I (resp., II) on* $[t,s]$ *is an* $\mathcal{F}_r$*-progressively measurable,* U *(resp.,* V*)-valued process. The set of all admissible controls for Player I (resp., II) on* $[t,s]$ *is denote by* $\mathcal{U}_{t,s}$ *(resp.,* $\mathcal{V}_{t,s}$*). If* $P\{u \equiv \bar{u},\ a.e.,\ in\ [t,s]\} = 1$*, we will identify both processes* u *and* $\bar{u}$ *in* $\mathcal{U}_{t,s}$*. Similarly we interpret* $v \equiv \bar{v}$ *on* $[t,s]$ *in* $\mathcal{V}_{t,s}$*.*

Definition 3.2. *A nonanticipative strategy for Player I on $[t,s]$ $(t<s\le T)$ is a mapping $\alpha:\ \mathcal{V}_{t,s}\to\mathcal{U}_{t,s}$ such that, for any $\mathbb{F}$-stopping time $S:\Omega\to[t,s]$ and any $v_1,v_2\in\mathcal{V}_{t,s}$, with $v_1\equiv v_2$ on $[[t,S]]$, it holds that $\alpha(v_1)\equiv\alpha(v_2)$ on $[[t,S]]$. Nonanticipative strategies for Player II on $[t,s]$, $\beta:\ \mathcal{U}_{t,s}\to\mathcal{V}_{t,s}$, are defined similarly. The set of all nonanticipative strategies $\alpha:\ \mathcal{V}_{t,s}\to\mathcal{U}_{t,s}$ for Player I on $[t,s]$ is denoted by $\mathcal{A}_{t,s}$. The set of all nonanticipative strategies $\beta:\ \mathcal{U}_{t,s}\to\mathcal{V}_{t,s}$ for Player II on $[t,s]$ is denoted by $\mathcal{B}_{t,s}$. (Recall that $[[t,S]]=\{(r,\omega)\in[0,T]\times\Omega,t\le r\le S(\omega).\}$)*

For given processes $u(\cdot)\in\mathcal{U}_{t,T},\ v(\cdot)\in\mathcal{V}_{t,T}$, initial data $t\in[0,T],\ \gamma_t\in\Lambda$, the cost functional is defined as follows:

$$J(\gamma_t;u,v):=Y^{\gamma_t;u,v}(t),\quad \gamma_t\in\Lambda, \tag{3.2}$$

where the process $Y^{\gamma_t;u,v}$ is defined by functional FBSDE (3.1).

For $\gamma_t\in\Lambda$, we define the lower value function of our stochastic differential games

$$W(\gamma_t):=\operatorname*{essinf}_{\beta\in\mathcal{B}_{t,T}}\operatorname*{esssup}_{u\in\mathcal{U}_{t,T}}J(\gamma_t;u,\beta(u)), \tag{3.3}$$

and its upper value function

$$U(\gamma_t):=\operatorname*{esssup}_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}_{t,T}}\operatorname*{essinf}_{v\in\mathcal{V}_{t,T}}J(\gamma_t;\alpha(v),v). \tag{3.4}$$

In Ji, Yang [13], they proved the following estimates:

Lemma 3.1. *Under the assumption* (**H**), *there exists some constant $C>0$ such that, for any $t\in[0,T],\ \gamma_t,\bar{\gamma}_t\in\Lambda,\ u(\cdot)\in\mathcal{U},\ v(\cdot)\in\mathcal{V}$,*

$$\begin{aligned}
&E[\sup_{s\in[t,T]}|X^{\gamma_t,u,v}(s)|^2|\mathcal{F}_t]\le C(1+\|\gamma_t\|^2),\\
&E[\sup_{s\in[t,T]}|X^{\gamma_t,u,v}(s)-X^{\bar{\gamma}_t,u,v}(s)|^2|\mathcal{F}_t]\le C\|\gamma_t-\bar{\gamma}_t\|^2,\\
&E[\sup_{s\in[t,T]}|Y^{\gamma_t,u,v}(s)|^2+\textstyle\int_t^T|Z^{\gamma_t,u,v}(s)|^2ds|\mathcal{F}_t]\le C(1+\|\gamma_t\|^2),\\
&E[\sup_{s\in[t,T]}|Y^{\gamma_t,u,v}(s)-Y^{\bar{\gamma}_t,u,v}(s)|^2+\textstyle\int_t^T|Z^{\gamma_t,u,v}(s)-Z^{\bar{\gamma}_t,u,v}(s)|^2ds|\mathcal{F}_t]\le C\|\gamma_t-\bar{\gamma}_t\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

As we known, the essential infimum and essential supremum on a family of random variables are still random variables. But by applying the method introduced by Buckdahn and Li [1], we get $W(\gamma_t)$ and $U(\gamma_t)$ are deterministic.

Proposition 3.1. *For any $t\in[0,T],\ \gamma_t\in\Lambda,\ W(\gamma_t)$ is a deterministic function in the sense that $W(\gamma_t)=E[W(\gamma_t)],\ P$-a.s.*

Proof. Let H denote the Cameron-Martin space of all absolutely continuous elements $h\in\Omega$ whose derivative $\dot{h}$ belongs to $L^2([0,T];\mathbb{R}^d)$.

For any $h\in H$, we define the mapping $\tau_h\omega:=\omega+h,\omega\in\Omega$. It is easy to check that $\tau_h:\Omega\to\Omega$ is a bijection, and its law is given by $P\circ[\tau_h]^{-1}=\exp\{\int_0^T\dot{h}(s)dB(s)-\frac{1}{2}\int_0^T|\dot{h}(s)|^2ds\}P$. For any fixed $t\in[0,T]$, set $H_t=\{h\in H|h(\cdot)=h(\cdot\wedge t)\}$. The proof can be separated into the following steps:

(1). For all $u\in\mathcal{U}_{t,T},\ h\in H_t,\ J(\gamma_t;u,v)(\tau_h)=J(\gamma_t;u(\tau_h),v(\tau_h)),$ P-a.s.

First, we make the transformation for the functional SDE:

$$\left\{\begin{array}{rcl} X^{\gamma_t;u,v}(s)\circ(\tau_h) & = & (\gamma_t(t)+\int_t^s b(X_r^{\gamma_t;u,v},u(r),v(r))dr+\int_t^s \sigma(X_r^{\gamma_t;u,v},u(r),v(r))dB(r))\circ(\tau_h)\\ & = & \gamma_t(t)+\int_t^s b(X_r^{\gamma_t;u,v}(\tau_h),u(\tau_h)(r),v(\tau_h)(r))dr\\ & & \qquad\qquad +\int_t^s \sigma(X_r^{\gamma_t;u,v}(\tau_h),u(\tau_h)(r),v(\tau_h)(r))dB(r),\\ X^{\gamma_t;u(\tau_h),v(\tau_h)}(s) & = & \gamma_t(t)+\int_t^s b(X_r^{\gamma_t;u(\tau_h),v(\tau_h)},u(\tau_h)(r),v(\tau_h)(r))dr\\ & & \qquad\qquad +\int_t^s \sigma(X_r^{\gamma_t;u(\tau_h),v(\tau_h)},u(\tau_h)(r),v(\tau_h)(r))dB(r), \end{array}\right. \tag{3.5}$$

then, from the uniqueness of the solution of the functional SDE, we get

$$X^{\gamma_t;u,v}(s)(\tau_h)=X^{\gamma_t;u(\tau_h),v(\tau_h)}(s),\ \text{for any } s\in[t,T],\ \text{P-a.s.}$$

Similarly, using the transformation to the BSDE in (3.1) and comparing the obtained equation with the BSDE obtained from (3.1) by replacing the transformed control process $u(\tau_h),\ v(\tau_h)$ for $u,\ v$, due to the uniqueness of the solution of the functional BSDE, we obtain

$$\begin{array}{rcl} Y^{\gamma_t;u,v}(s)(\tau_h) & = & Y^{\gamma_t;u(\tau_h),v(\tau_h)}(s),\ \text{for any } s\in[t,T],\ \text{P-a.s.},\\ Z^{\gamma_t;u,v}(s)(\tau_h) & = & Z^{\gamma_t;u(\tau_h),v(\tau_h)}(s),\ \text{dsdP-a.e. on } [0,T]\times\Omega. \end{array}$$

Hence

$$J(\gamma_t;u,v)(\tau_h)=J(\gamma_t;u(\tau_h),v(\tau_h)),\ \text{P-a.s.}$$

(2). For $\beta\in\mathcal{B}_{t,T},\ h\in H_t$, let $\beta^h(u):=\beta(u(\tau_{-h}))(\tau_h),\ u\in\mathcal{U}_{t,T}$. Then, $\beta^h\in\mathcal{B}_{t,T}$.

Obviously, β^h maps $\mathcal{U}_{t,T}$ into $\mathcal{V}_{t,T}$. Moreover, this mapping is nonanticipating. Indeed, let $S:\Omega\to[t,T]$ be an $\mathbb{F}$-stopping time and $u_1,u_2\in\mathcal{U}_{t,T}$, with $u_1\equiv u_2$ on $[[t,S]]$. Then, obviously, $u_1(\tau_{-h})\equiv u_2(\tau_{-h})$ on $[[t,S(\tau_{-h})]]$. Therefore,

$$\beta^h(u_1)=\beta(u_1(\tau_{-h}))(\tau_h)=\beta(u_2(\tau_{-h}))(\tau_h)=\beta^h(u_2)\ \text{on}\ [[t,S]].$$

(3). For any $h\in H_t$, and $\beta\in\mathcal{B}_{t,T}$, we have

$$\{\operatorname*{esssup}_{u\in\mathcal{U}_{t,T}} J(\gamma_t;u,\beta(u))\}(\tau_h)=\operatorname*{esssup}_{u\in\mathcal{U}_{t,T}}\{J(\gamma_t;u,\beta(u))(\tau_h)\},\ \text{P-a.s.}$$

In fact, for convenience, setting $I(\gamma_t;\beta):=\operatorname*{esssup}_{u\in\mathcal{U}_{t,T}} J(\gamma_t;u,\beta(u)),\ \beta\in\mathcal{B}_{t,T}$, we have $I(\gamma_t;\beta)\geq J(\gamma_t;u,\beta(u))$. Then $I(\gamma_t;\beta)(\tau_h)\geq J(\gamma_t;u,\beta(u))(\tau_h)$, P-a.s., for all $u\in\mathcal{U}_{t,T}$. Therefore,

$$\{\operatorname*{esssup}_{u\in\mathcal{U}_{t,T}} J(\gamma_t;u,\beta(u))\}(\tau_h)\geq\operatorname*{esssup}_{u\in\mathcal{U}_{t,T}}\{J(\gamma_t;u,\beta(u))(\tau_h)\},\ \text{P-a.s.}$$

On the other hand, for any random variable ξ which satisfies $\xi\geq J(\gamma_t;u,\beta(u))(\tau_h)$, we have $\xi(\tau_{-h})\geq J(\gamma_t;u,\beta(u))$, P-a.s., for all $u\in\mathcal{U}_{t,T}$. So $\xi(\tau_{-h})\geq I(\gamma_t;\beta)$, P-a.s., i.e. $\xi\geq I(\gamma_t;\beta)(\tau_h)$, P-a.s. Thus,

$$J(\gamma_t;u,\beta(u))(\tau_h)\geq\{\operatorname*{esssup}_{u\in\mathcal{U}_{t,T}} J(\gamma_t;u,\beta(u))\}(\tau_h),\ \text{P-a.s., for any } u\in\mathcal{U}_{t,T}.$$

Therefore,

$$\operatorname*{esssup}_{u\in\mathcal{U}_{t,T}}\{J(\gamma_t;u,\beta(u))(\tau_h)\}\geq\{\operatorname*{esssup}_{u\in\mathcal{U}_{t,T}} J(\gamma_t;u,\beta(u))\}(\tau_h),\ \text{P-a.s.}$$

From above we get

$$\{\operatorname*{esssup}_{u\in\mathcal{U}_{t,T}} J(\gamma_t;u,\beta(u))\}(\tau_h)=\operatorname*{esssup}_{u\in\mathcal{U}_{t,T}}\{J(\gamma_t;u,\beta(u))(\tau_h)\},\ \text{P-a.s.}$$

(4). Under the Girsanov transformation τ_h, $W(\gamma_t)$ is invariant, i.e.,

$$W(\gamma_t)(\tau_h)=W(\gamma_t),\ \text{P-a.s., for any } h\in H.$$

In fact, similarly to the third step, for all $h\in H_t$, we can prove

$$\{\operatorname*{essinf}_{\beta\in\mathcal{B}_{t,T}} I(\gamma_t;\beta)\}(\tau_h)=\operatorname*{essinf}_{\beta\in\mathcal{B}_{t,T}}\{I(\gamma_t;\beta)(\tau_h)\},\ \text{P-a.s.}$$

From the first step and the third one, for all $h\in H_t$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}W(\gamma_t)(\tau_h)&=\{\operatorname*{essinf}_{\beta\in\mathcal{B}_{t,T}}\operatorname*{esssup}_{u\in\mathcal{U}_{t,T}} J(\gamma_t;u,\beta(u))\}(\tau_h),\\&=\operatorname*{essinf}_{\beta\in\mathcal{B}_{t,T}}\operatorname*{esssup}_{u\in\mathcal{U}_{t,T}}\{J(\gamma_t;u,\beta(u))(\tau_h)\},\\&=\operatorname*{essinf}_{\beta\in\mathcal{B}_{t,T}}\operatorname*{esssup}_{u\in\mathcal{U}_{t,T}}\{J(\gamma_t;u(\tau_h),\beta^h(u(\tau_h)))\},\\&=\operatorname*{essinf}_{\beta\in\mathcal{B}_{t,T}}\operatorname*{esssup}_{u\in\mathcal{U}_{t,T}} J(\gamma_t;u,\beta(u)),\\&=W(\gamma_t),\ \text{P-a.s.}\end{aligned}$$

In the latter equality we have used $\{u(\tau_h)\mid u(\cdot)\in\mathcal{U}_{t,T}\}=\mathcal{U}_{t,T}$ and $\{\beta^h\mid\beta\in\mathcal{B}_{t,T}\}=\mathcal{B}_{t,T}$. Therefore, for any $h\in H_t$, $W(\gamma_t)(\tau_h)=W(\gamma_t)$, P-a.s., and since $W(\gamma_t)$ is $\mathcal{F}_t$-measurable, we have this relation for all $h\in H$.

Combined with the following auxiliary lemma we can complete the proof.

□

Lemma 3.2. *Let ζ be a random variable defined over our classical Wiener space $(\Omega,\mathcal{F}_T,P)$, such that $\zeta(\tau_h)=\zeta$, P-a.s., for any $h\in H$. Then $\zeta=E\zeta$, P-a.s.*

Proof. Its proof can be found in Buckdahn and Li [1].

□

From the definition of $W(\gamma_t)$ and Lemma 3.1, we have the following property.

Lemma 3.3. *There exists some constant $C>0$ such that, for all $0\le t\le T$, $\gamma_t,\bar{\gamma}_t\in\Lambda$,*

$$\begin{aligned}&\text{(i)}\ \ |W(\gamma_t)-W(\bar{\gamma}_t)|\le C\|\gamma_t-\bar{\gamma}_t\|;\\&\text{(ii)}\ \ |W(\gamma_t)|\le C(1+\|\gamma_t\|).\end{aligned}\tag{3.6}$$

Now we adopt Peng's notion of stochastic backward semigroup to discuss a generalized DPP for our stochastic differential game (3.1), (3.3). The notation of stochastic backward semigroup was first introduced by Peng [20] to prove the DPP for stochastic control problems. First we define the family of (backward) semigroups associated with FBSDE (3.1).

For given initial data γ_t, a number $0<\delta\le T-t$, admissible control processes $u(\cdot)\in\mathcal{U}_{t,t+\delta}$, $v(\cdot)\in\mathcal{V}_{t,t+\delta}$, we put

$$G^{\gamma_t;u,v}_{s,t+\delta}[\eta]:=\tilde{Y}^{\gamma_t;u,v}(s),\ s\in[t,t+\delta],$$

where $\eta \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_t^{t+\delta}, P; \mathbb{R}^n)$, $(\tilde{Y}^{\gamma_t;u,v}(s), \tilde{Z}^{\gamma_t;u,v}(s))_{t\leq s\leq t+\delta}$ is the solution of the following functional FBSDE with the time horizon $t+\delta$:

$$\begin{cases} d\tilde{Y}^{\gamma_t;u,v}(s) &= -f(s, X_s^{\gamma_t;u,v}, \tilde{Y}^{\gamma_t;u,v}(s), \tilde{Z}^{\gamma_t;u,v}(s), u(s), v(s))ds + \tilde{Z}^{\gamma_t;u,v}(s)dB(s), \\ \tilde{Y}^{\gamma_t;u,v}(t+\delta) &= \eta,\ s \in [t, t+\delta]. \end{cases} \tag{3.7}$$

Also, we have

$$G_{t,T}^{\gamma_t;u,v}[\Phi(X_T^{\gamma_t;u,v})] = G_{t,t+\delta}^{\gamma_t;u,v}[Y^{\gamma_t;u,v}(t+\delta)].$$

Theorem 3.2. *Under the assumption* $(\mathbf{H})$*, the lower value function* $W(\gamma_t)$ *satisfies the following DPP: for any* $\gamma_t \in \Lambda,\ \delta > 0,$

$$W(\gamma_t) = \operatorname*{essinf}_{\beta\in\mathcal{B}_{t,t+\delta}} \operatorname*{esssup}_{u\in\mathcal{U}_{t,t+\delta}} G_{t,t+\delta}^{\gamma_t;u,\beta(u)}[W(X_{t+\delta}^{\gamma_t;u,\beta(u)})].$$

The proof is given in the Appendix.

4 Viscosity Solutions of Path-dependent HJBI equation

In this section, we will study the following path-dependent PDE:

$$\begin{cases} D_tW(\gamma_t) + H^-(\gamma_t, W, D_xW, D_{xx}W) = 0, \\ W(\gamma_T) = \Phi(\gamma_T), \qquad \gamma_T \in \Lambda, \end{cases} \tag{4.1}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} D_tU(\gamma_t) + H^+(\gamma_t, U, D_xU, D_{xx}U) = 0, \\ U(\gamma_t) = \Phi(\gamma_T), \quad \gamma_T \in \Lambda, \end{cases} \tag{4.2}$$

where

$$H^-(\gamma_t, W, D_xW, D_{xx}W) = \sup_{u\in U}\inf_{v\in V} H(\gamma_t, W, D_xW, D_{xx}W, u, v),$$

$$H^+(\gamma_t, U, D_xU, D_{xx}U) = \inf_{v\in V}\sup_{u\in U} H(\gamma_t, U, D_xU, D_{xx}U, u, v),$$

and

$$H(\gamma_t, y, p, X, u, v) = \tfrac{1}{2}tr(\sigma\sigma^T(\gamma_t, u, v)X) + p.b(\gamma_t, u, v) + f(\gamma_t, y, p.\sigma(\gamma_t, u, v), u, v),$$

where $(\gamma_t, y, p, X) \in \Lambda \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{S}^d$ ($\mathbb{S}^d$ denotes the set of $d \times d$ symmetric matrices).

We will show that the value function $W(\gamma_t)$ (resp., $U(\gamma_t)$) defined in (3.3) (resp., (3.4)) is a viscosity solution of the corresponding equation (4.1) (resp., (4.2)). First we give the definition of viscosity solution for this kind of PDEs. For more information on viscosity solution, the reader is referred to Crandall, Ishii and Lions [5].

Definition 4.1. *A real-valued* Λ*-continuous function* $W \in \mathbb{C}(\Lambda)$ *is called*
(i) *a viscosity subsolution of equation (4.1) if for any* $\delta > 0$, $\Gamma \in \mathbb{C}_{l,b}^{1,2}(\Lambda)$, $\gamma_t \in \Lambda$ *satisfying* $\Gamma \geq W$ *on* $\bigcup_{0\leq s\leq\delta} \Lambda_{t+s}$ *and* $\Gamma(\gamma_t) = W(\gamma_t)$*, we have*

$$D_t\Gamma(\gamma_t) + H^-(\gamma_t, \Gamma, D_x\Gamma, D_{xx}\Gamma) \geq 0,$$

(ii) *a viscosity supersolution of equation (4.1) if for any* $\delta > 0$, $\Gamma \in \mathbb{C}_{l,b}^{1,2}(\Lambda)$, $\gamma_t \in \Lambda$ *satisfying* $\Gamma \leq W$ *on* $\bigcup_{0\leq s\leq\delta} \Lambda_{t+s}$ *and* $\Gamma(\gamma_t) = W(\gamma_t)$*, we have*

$$D_t\Gamma(\gamma_t) + H^-(\gamma_t, \Gamma, D_x\Gamma, D_{xx}\Gamma) \leq 0,$$

(iii) *a viscosity solution of equation (4.1) if it is both a viscosity sub- and supersolution of equation (4.1).*

Theorem 4.1. *Under the assumption* (**H**)*, the lower value function W is a viscosity solution of path-dependent HJBI equation (4.1) on Λ, the upper value function U is a viscosity solution of (4.2).*

First we prove some auxiliary lemmas. Denote

$$\begin{aligned} F(\gamma_s, y, z, u, v) &= D_s\Gamma(\gamma_s) + \tfrac{1}{2}tr(\sigma\sigma^T(\gamma_s, u, v)D_{xx}\Gamma(\gamma_s)) + D_x\Gamma(\gamma_s).b(\gamma_s, u, v) \\ &\quad + f(\gamma_s, y + \Gamma(\gamma_s), z + D_x\Gamma(\gamma_s).\sigma(\gamma_s, u, v), u, v), \end{aligned}$$

where $(\gamma_s, y, z, u, v) \in \Lambda \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times U \times V$.

Now consider the following BSDE:

$$\begin{cases} -dY^{1,u,v}(s) = F(X_s^{\gamma_t;u,v}, Y^{1,u,v}(s), Z^{1,u,v}(s), u(s), v(s))ds - Z^{1,u,v}(s)dB(s), \\ Y^{1,u,v}(t+\delta) = 0, \ s \in [t, t+\delta]. \end{cases} \tag{4.3}$$

Lemma 4.1. *For every $s \in [t, t+\delta]$, we have the following relationship:*

$$Y^{1,u,v}(s) = G_{s,t+\delta}^{\gamma_t;u,v}[\Gamma(X_{t+\delta}^{\gamma_t;u,v})] - \Gamma(X_s^{\gamma_t;u,v}), \ P\text{-a.s.}$$

Proof. Note $G_{s,t+\delta}^{\gamma_t;u,v}[\Gamma(X_{t+\delta}^{\gamma_t;u,v})]$ is defined as $G_{s,t+\delta}^{\gamma_t;u,v}[\Gamma(X_{t+\delta}^{\gamma_t;u,v})] = Y^{u,v}(s)$ through the following BSDE:

$$\begin{cases} -dY^{u,v}(s) = f(X_s^{\gamma_t;u,v}, Y^{u,v}(s), Z^{u,v}(s), u(s), v(s))ds - Z^{u,v}(s)dB(s), \\ Y^{u,v}(t+\delta) = \Gamma(X_{t+\delta}^{\gamma_t;u,v}), \ s \in [t, t+\delta]. \end{cases}$$

By applying Itô's formula to $\Gamma(X_s^{\gamma_t;u,v})$, we have

$$d(Y^{u,v}(s) - \Gamma(X_s^{\gamma_t;u,v})) = dY^{1,u,v}(s),$$

combined with $Y^{u,v}(t+\delta) - \Gamma(X_{t+\delta}^{\gamma_t;u,v}) = 0 = Y^{1,u,v}(t+\delta)$, we get the desired result.

□

Now we consider the following BSDE:

$$\begin{cases} -dY^{2,u,v}(s) = F(\gamma_t, Y^{2,u,v}(s), Z^{2,u,v}(s), u(s), v(s))ds - Z^{2,u,v}(s)dB(s), \\ Y^{2,u,v}(t+\delta) = 0, \ s \in [t, t+\delta]. \end{cases} \tag{4.4}$$

Then, we have the following lemma

Lemma 4.2. *For every $u \in \mathcal{U}_{t,t+\delta}$, $v \in \mathcal{V}_{t,t+\delta}$, we have*

$$|Y^{1,u,v}(t) - Y^{2,u,v}(t)| \leq C\delta^{\frac{3}{2}}, \quad P\text{-a.s.}$$

where C is independent of the control processes u, v and of $\delta > 0$.

Proof. From Lemma 3.2, we have there exists some constant $C > 0$ such that

$$E[\sup_{s\in[t,T]} |X^{\gamma_t;u,v}(s)|^2 | \mathcal{F}_t] \leq C(1 + \|\gamma_t\|^2),$$

combined with

$$
\begin{aligned}
& E[\sup_{s\in[t,t+\delta]}|X^{\gamma_t;u,v}(s)-\gamma_t(t)|^2|\mathcal{F}_t] \\
\leq\ & 2E[\sup_{s\in[t,t+\delta]}|\int_t^s b(X_r^{\gamma_t;u,v},u(r),v(r))dr|^2|\mathcal{F}_t]+2E[\sup_{s\in[t,t+\delta]}|\int_t^s \sigma(X_r^{\gamma_t;u,v},u(r),v(r))dB(r)|^2|\mathcal{F}_t]
\end{aligned}
$$

we have

$$E[\sup_{s\in[t,t+\delta]}|X^{\gamma_t;u,v}(s)-\gamma_t(t)|^2|\mathcal{F}_t]\leq C\delta.$$

From (4.3) and (4.4), using Lemma 2.3, set

$$\xi_1=\xi_2=0,\ g(s,y,z)=F(X_s^{\gamma_t;u,v},y,z,u_s,v_s),$$

$$\varphi_1(s)=0,\ \varphi_2(s)=F(\gamma_t,Y^{2,u,v}(s),Z^{2,u,v}(s),u_s,v_s)-F(X_s^{\gamma_t;u,v},Y^{2,u,v}(s),Z^{2,u,v}(s),u_s,v_s).$$

Denote $\rho_0(r)=(1+|x|^2)r$, due to b,σ,f are Lipishtiz and linear growth, $\Gamma\in\mathbb{C}_b^{1,2}$, $|\varphi_2(s)|\leq\rho_0(|X_s^{\gamma_t;u,v}-\gamma_t(t)|)$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& E[\int_t^{t+\delta}(|Y^{1,u,v}(s)-Y^{2,u,v}(s)|^2+|Z^{1,u,v}(s)-Z^{2,u,v}(s)|^2)ds|\mathcal{F}_t] \\
\leq\ & E[\int_t^{t+\delta}\rho_0^2(|X_s^{\gamma_t;u,v}-\gamma_t(t)|)ds|\mathcal{F}_t] \\
\leq\ & C\delta E[\sup_{s\in[t,t+\delta]}\rho_0^2(|X_s^{\gamma_t;u,v}-\gamma_t(t)|)|\mathcal{F}_t] \\
\leq\ & C\delta^2.
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& |Y^{1,u,v}(t)-Y^{2,u,v}(t)|=|E[(Y^{1,u,v}(s)-Y^{2,u,v}(s))|\mathcal{F}_t]| \\
=\ & |E[\int_t^{t+\delta}(F(X_s^{\gamma_t;u,v},Y^{1,u,v}(s),Z^{1,u,v}(s),u(s),v(s))-F(\gamma_t,Y^{2,u,v}(s),Z^{2,u,v}(s),u(s),v(s)))ds|\mathcal{F}_t]| \\
\leq\ & CE[\int_t^{t+\delta}[\rho_0(|X_s^{\gamma_t;u,v}-\gamma_t|)+|Y^{1,u,v}(s)-Y^{2,u,v}(s)|+|Z^{1,u,v}(s)-Z^{2,u,v}(s)|]ds|\mathcal{F}_t] \\
\leq\ & CE[\int_t^{t+\delta}\rho_0(|X_s^{\gamma_t;u,v}-\gamma_t|)ds|\mathcal{F}_t]+C\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}E[\int_t^{t+\delta}|Y^{1,u,v}(s)-Y^{2,u,v}(s)|^2ds|\mathcal{F}_t]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& +C\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}E[\int_t^{t+\delta}|Z^{1,u,v}(s)-Z^{2,u,v}(s)|^2ds|\mathcal{F}_t]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
\leq\ & C\delta^{\frac{3}{2}}.
\end{aligned}
$$

$\square$

Lemma 4.3. *Let $Y_0(\cdot)$ be the solution of the following ordinary differential equation:*

$$
\left\{
\begin{aligned}
-dY_0(s) &= F_0(\gamma_t,Y_0(s),0)ds,\ s\in[t,t+\delta], \\
Y_0(t+\delta) &= 0,
\end{aligned}
\right.
\tag{4.5}
$$

where the function F_0 is defined by

$$F_0(\gamma_t,y,z)=\sup_{u\in U}\inf_{v\in V}F(\gamma_t,y,z,u,v).$$

Then, P-a.s.,

$$Y_0(t)=\operatorname*{esssup}_{u\in\mathcal{U}_{t,t+\delta}}\operatorname*{essinf}_{v\in\mathcal{V}_{t,t+\delta}}Y^{2,u,v}(t).$$

Proof. First we introduce the function

$$F_1(\gamma_t,y,z,u)=\inf_{v\in V}F(\gamma_t,y,z,u,v),\ (\gamma_t,y,z,u)\in\Lambda\times\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^d\times U$$

and consider the following equation:

$$\begin{cases}-dY^{3,u}(s) &= F_1(\gamma_t,Y^{3,u}(s),Z^{3,u}(s),u(s))ds-Z^{3,u}(s)dB(s),\quad s\in[t,t+\delta],\\ Y^{3,u}(t+\delta) &= 0,\end{cases}\tag{4.6}$$

according to Lemma 2.1, for every $u\in\mathcal{U}_{t,t+\delta}$, there exists a unique solution $(Y^{3,u},Z^{3,u})$ to (4.6). Moreover,

$$Y^{3,u}(t)=\operatorname*{essinf}_{v\in\mathcal{V}_{t,t+\delta}}Y^{2,u,v}(t),\ \text{P-a.s. for every } u\in\mathcal{U}_{t,t+\delta}.$$

In fact, from the definition of F_1 and Lemma 2.2 (comparison theorem), we have

$$Y^{3,u}(t)\le Y^{2,u,v}(t),\ \text{P-a.s. for any } v\in\mathcal{V}_{t,t+\delta}, \text{for every } u\in\mathcal{U}_{t,t+\delta}.$$

On the other hand, there exists a measurable function $v^4:\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^d\times U\to V$ such that

$$F_1(\gamma_t,y,z,u)=F(\gamma_t,y,z,u,v^4(y,z,u)),\ \text{for any } y,z,u.$$

We then put $\widetilde{v}^4(s)=v^4(Y^{3,u}(s),Z^{3,u}(s),u(s)),\ s\in[t,t+\delta]$, and we observe that $\widetilde{v}^4\in\mathcal{V}_{t,t+\delta}$. Consequently from the uniqueness of the solution of (4.6), it follows that $(Y^{3,u},Z^{3,u})=(Y^{2,u,\widetilde{v}^4},Z^{2,u,\widetilde{v}^4})$, and in particular, $Y^{3,u}(t)=Y^{2,u,\widetilde{v}^4}(t)$, P-a.s. for every $u\in\mathcal{U}_{t,t+\delta}$. This proves that $Y^{3,u}(t)=\operatorname*{essinf}_{v\in\mathcal{V}_{t,t+\delta}}Y^{2,u,v}(t)$, P-a.s. for every $u\in\mathcal{U}_{t,t+\delta}$.

Finally, since $F_0(\gamma_t,y,z)=\sup_{u\in U}F_1(\gamma_t,y,z,u)$, by a similar proof we have

$$Y_0(t)=\operatorname*{esssup}_{u\in\mathcal{U}_{t,t+\delta}}Y^{3,u}(t)=\operatorname*{esssup}_{u\in\mathcal{U}_{t,t+\delta}}\operatorname*{essinf}_{v\in\mathcal{V}_{t,t+\delta}}Y^{2,u,v}(t),\text{P-a.s.}$$

□

Lemma 4.4. *For every $u\in\mathcal{U}_{t,t+\delta},\ v\in\mathcal{V}_{t,t+\delta}$, we have*

$$E[\int_t^{t+\delta}(|Y^{2,u,v}(s)|+|Z^{2,u,v}(s)|)ds\mid\mathcal{F}_t]\le C\delta^{\frac{3}{2}},\quad P\text{-a.s.},\tag{4.7}$$

where the constant C is independent of the control processes $u,\ v$ and of $\delta>0$.

Proof. Since $F(\gamma_t,\cdot,\cdot,u,v)$ has a linear growth in (y,z), uniformly in (u,v), we get from Lemma 2.3, for some constant $C>0$ independent of δ and the control processes $u,\ v$, P-a.s.

$$|Y^{2,u,v}(s)|^2\le C\delta,\ E[\int_s^{t+\delta}|Z^{2,u,v}(r)|^2dr\mid\mathcal{F}_s]\le C\delta.$$

On the other hand, from equation (4.4)

$$\begin{aligned}|Y^{2,u,v}(s)| &\le E[\textstyle\int_s^{t+\delta}F(\gamma_t,Y^{2,u,v}(r),Z^{2,u,v}(r),u(r),v(r))dr\mid\mathcal{F}_s]\\ &\le CE[\textstyle\int_s^{t+\delta}(1+\|\gamma_t\|^2+|Y^{2,u,v}(r)|+|Z^{2,u,v}(r)|)dr\mid\mathcal{F}_s]\\ &\le C\delta+C\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}E[\textstyle\int_s^{t+\delta}|Z^{2,u,v}(r)|^2dr\mid\mathcal{F}_s]\\ &\le C\delta,\quad s\in[t,t+\delta],\end{aligned}$$

and applying Itô's formula, we get

$$E[\int_t^{t+\delta}|Z^{2,u,v}(s)|^2ds \mid \mathcal{F}_t] \leq C\delta^2, \quad \text{P-a.s.}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & E[\int_t^{t+\delta}(|Y^{2,u,v}(s)|+|Z^{2,u,v}(s)|)ds \mid \mathcal{F}_t] \\ \leq\ & C\delta^2 + C\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}(E[\int_t^{t+\delta}|Z^{2,u,v}(s)|^2dr \mid \mathcal{F}_t])^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ \leq\ & C\delta^{\frac{3}{2}} \ \ \text{P-a.s.} \end{aligned}$$

□

Now we are able to finish the proof of Theorem 4.2.

Proof. (1) First we will prove $W(\gamma_t)$ is a viscosity supersolution. Given $\gamma_t \in \Lambda$, for any $\delta > 0$, suppose $\Gamma(\gamma_t) = W(\gamma_t)$ and $W \geq \Gamma$ on $\bigcup\limits_{0\leq s\leq\delta} \Lambda_{t+s}$.

Due to the DPP (Theorem 3.2), we have

$$\Gamma(\gamma_t) = W(\gamma_t) = \operatorname*{essinf}_{\beta\in\mathcal{B}_{t,t+\delta}} \operatorname*{esssup}_{u\in\mathcal{U}_{t,t+\delta}} G^{\gamma_t;u,\beta(u)}_{t,t+\delta}[W(X^{\gamma_t;u,\beta(u)}_{t+\delta})].$$

From $W \geq \Gamma$ on $\bigcup\limits_{0\leq s\leq\delta} \Lambda_{t+s}$ and the monotonicity property of $G^{\gamma_t;u,\beta(u)}_{t,t+\delta}[\cdot]$ (see Lemma 2.2) we obtain

$$\operatorname*{essinf}_{\beta\in\mathcal{B}_{t,t+\delta}} \operatorname*{esssup}_{u\in\mathcal{U}_{t,t+\delta}} G^{\gamma_t;u,\beta(u)}_{t,t+\delta}[\Gamma(X^{\gamma_t;u,\beta(u)}_{t+\delta})] - \Gamma(\gamma_t) \leq 0. \tag{4.8}$$

From Lemma 4.1, we have

$$\operatorname*{essinf}_{\beta\in\mathcal{B}_{t,t+\delta}} \operatorname*{esssup}_{u\in\mathcal{U}_{t,t+\delta}} Y^{1,u,\beta(u)}(t) \leq 0, \ \text{P-a.s.}$$

Thus, from Lemma 4.2, we get

$$\operatorname*{essinf}_{\beta\in\mathcal{B}_{t,t+\delta}} \operatorname*{esssup}_{u\in\mathcal{U}_{t,t+\delta}} Y^{2,u,\beta(u)}(t) \leq C\delta^{\frac{3}{2}}, \ \text{P-a.s.}$$

Consequently, since $\operatorname*{essinf}_{v\in\mathcal{V}_{t,t+\delta}} Y^{2,u,v}(t) \leq Y^{2,u,\beta(u)}(t), \ \beta \in \mathcal{B}_{t,t+\delta}$, we get

$$\operatorname*{esssup}_{u\in\mathcal{U}_{t,t+\delta}} \operatorname*{essinf}_{v\in\mathcal{V}_{t,t+\delta}} Y^{2,u,v}(t) \leq \operatorname*{essinf}_{\beta\in\mathcal{B}_{t,t+\delta}} \operatorname*{esssup}_{u\in\mathcal{U}_{t,t+\delta}} Y^{2,u,\beta(u)}(t) \leq C\delta^{\frac{3}{2}}, \ \text{P-a.s.}$$

Thus, by Lemma 4.3, $Y_0(t) \leq C\delta^{\frac{3}{2}}$, P-a.s., where $Y_0(\cdot)$ is the unique solution of (4.5). Consequently,

$$C\delta^{\frac{1}{2}} \geq \frac{1}{\delta}Y_0(t) = \frac{1}{\delta}\int_t^{t+\delta} F_0(\gamma_t, Y_0(s), 0)ds, \ \delta > 0,$$

$$\sup_{u\in U} \inf_{v\in V} F(\gamma_t, 0, 0, u, v) = F_0(\gamma_t, 0, 0) \leq 0,$$

and from the definition of F we see that W is a viscosity supersolution of (4.1).

(2) Now we prove W is a viscosity subsolution.

Given $\gamma_t \in \Lambda$, for any $\delta > 0$, suppose $\Gamma(\gamma_t) = W(\gamma_t)$ and $\Gamma \geq W$ on $\bigcup\limits_{0\leq s\leq\delta} \Lambda_{t+s}$.

We must prove that

$$\sup_{u\in\mathcal{U}} \inf_{v\in V} F(\gamma_t, 0, 0, u, v) = F_0(\gamma_t, 0, 0) \geq 0.$$

Let us suppose that this is not true. Then there exists some $\theta > 0$ such that

$$F_0(\gamma_t, 0, 0) = \sup_{u\in\mathcal{U}} \inf_{v\in V} F(\gamma_t, 0, 0, u, v) \leq -\theta < 0. \tag{4.9}$$

and we can find a measurable function $\psi : U \to V$ such that

$$F(\gamma_t, 0, 0, u, \psi(u)) \leq -\frac{3}{4}\theta, \text{ for all } u \in U.$$

On the other hand, due to the DPP (see Theorem 3.2),

$$\Gamma(\gamma_t) = W(\gamma_t) = \operatorname*{essinf}_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}_{t,t+\delta}} \operatorname*{esssup}_{u \in \mathcal{U}_{t,t+\delta}} G^{\gamma_t;u,\beta(u)}_{t,t+\delta}[W(X^{\gamma_t,u,\beta(u)}_{t+\delta})], \ 0 \leq \delta \leq \delta_0.$$

And from $W \leq \Gamma$ on $\bigcup\limits_{0 \leq s \leq \delta} \Lambda_{t+s}$ and the monotonicity property of $G^{\gamma_t;u,\beta(u)}_{t,t+\delta}[\cdot]$ (see Theorem 2.2) we obtain

$$\operatorname*{essinf}_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}_{t,t+\delta}} \operatorname*{esssup}_{u \in \mathcal{U}_{t,t+\delta}} G^{\gamma_t;u,\beta(u)}_{t,t+\delta}[\Gamma(X^{u,\beta(u)}_{t+\delta})] - \Gamma(\gamma_t) \geq 0, \text{ P-a.s.},$$

Then, similar to (1), from the definition of backward semigroup, we have

$$\operatorname*{essinf}_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}_{t,t+\delta}} \operatorname*{esssup}_{u \in \mathcal{U}_{t,t+\delta}} Y^{1,u,\beta(u)}(t) \geq 0, \text{ P-a.s.},$$

and, in particular,

$$\operatorname*{esssup}_{u \in \mathcal{U}_{t,t+\delta}} Y^{1,u,\psi(u)}(t) \geq 0, \text{ P-a.s.}.$$

Here, by putting $\psi_s(u)(\omega) = \psi(u(s)(\omega)), \ (s, \omega) \in [t, T] \times \Omega$, we identify ψ as an element of $\mathcal{B}_{t,t+\delta}$. Given any $\varepsilon > 0$ we can choose $u^\varepsilon \in \mathcal{U}_{t,t+\delta}$ such that $Y^{1,u^\varepsilon,\psi(u^\varepsilon)}(t) \geq -\varepsilon\delta$.
From Lemma 4.2 we have

$$Y^{2,u^\varepsilon,\psi(u^\varepsilon)}(t) \geq -C\delta^{\frac{3}{2}} - \varepsilon\delta, \text{ P-a.s.} \tag{4.10}$$

Moreover, from (4.4)

$$Y^{2,u^\varepsilon,\psi(u^\varepsilon)}(t) = E[\int_t^{t+\delta} F(\gamma_t, Y^{2,u^\varepsilon,\psi(u^\varepsilon)}(s), Z^{2,u^\varepsilon,\psi(u^\varepsilon)}(s), u^\varepsilon(s), \psi(u^\varepsilon(s)))ds|\mathcal{F}_t].$$

we get from (4.4)

$$\begin{aligned} Y^{2,u^\varepsilon,\psi(u^\varepsilon)}(t) &\leq E[\int_t^{t+\delta} (C|Y^{2,u^\varepsilon,\psi(u^\varepsilon)}(s)| + C|Z^{2,u^\varepsilon,\psi(u^\varepsilon)}(s)| + F(\gamma_t, 0, 0, u^\varepsilon(s), \psi(u^\varepsilon(s))))ds|\mathcal{F}_t] \\ &\leq C\delta^{\frac{3}{2}} - \tfrac{3}{4}\theta\delta, \text{ P-a.s.} \end{aligned} \tag{4.11}$$

From (4.10) and (4.11), $-C\delta^{\frac{1}{2}} - \varepsilon \leq C\delta^{\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{3}{4}\theta$, P-a.s. Letting $\delta \downarrow 0$, and then $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$, we get that $\theta \leq 0$, which induces a contradiction. Therefore,

$$\sup_{u \in U} \inf_{v \in V} F(\gamma_t, 0, 0, u, v) = F_0(\gamma_t, 0, 0) \leq 0,$$

and from the definition of F we see that W is a viscosity supersolution of (4.1). At last, from the above two steps, we derive that W is a viscosity solution of (4.1).

The similar argument for U, we also get that U is a viscosity solution of (4.2).

□

Appendix: Proof of Theorem 3.2 (DPP)

Proof. For convenience, we set

$$W_\delta(\gamma_t) = \operatorname*{essinf}_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}_{t,t+\delta}} \operatorname*{esssup}_{u \in \mathcal{U}_{t,t+\delta}} G^{\gamma_t;u,\beta(u)}_{t,t+\delta}[W(X^{\gamma_t;u,\beta(u)}_{t+\delta})].$$

We want to prove $W_\delta(\gamma_t)$ and $W(\gamma_t)$ are the same. For it we only need to prove the following three lemmas. □

Lemma 4.5. *$W_\delta(\gamma_t)$ is deterministic.*

The proof of this lemma is similar to the proof of Proposition 3.1, so we omit it here.

Lemma 4.6. *$W_\delta(\gamma_t) \le W(\gamma_t)$.*

Proof. Let $\beta \in \mathcal{B}_{t,T}$ be arbitrarily fixed. Then, given a $u_2(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_{t+\delta,T}$, we define as follows the restriction β_1 of β to $\mathcal{U}_{t,t+\delta}$:

$$\beta_1(u_1) := \beta(u_1 \oplus u_2)|_{[t,t+\delta]}, \quad u_1(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_{t,t+\delta},$$

where $u_1 \oplus u_2 := u_1 \mathbf{1}_{[t,t+\delta]} + u_2 \mathbf{1}_{(t+\delta,T]}$, extends $u_1(\cdot)$ to an element of $\mathcal{U}_{t,T}$. It is easy to check that $\beta_1 \in \mathcal{B}_{t,t+\delta}$. Moreover, from the nonanticipativity property of β we deduce that β_1 is independent of the special choice of $u_2(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_{t+\delta,T}$. Consequently, from the definition of $W_\delta(\gamma_t)$,

$$W_\delta(\gamma_t) \le \operatorname*{esssup}_{u_1 \in \mathcal{U}_{t,t+\delta}} G^{\gamma_t;u_1,\beta_1(u_1)}_{t,t+\delta}[W(X^{\gamma_t;u_1,\beta_1(u_1)}_{t+\delta})], \text{ P-a.s.}$$

we use the notation $I_\delta(\gamma_t, u, v) := G^{\gamma_t;u,v}_{t,t+\delta}[W(X^{\gamma_t;u,v}_{t+\delta})]$ and notice that there exists a sequence $\{u_i^1, i \ge 1\} \subset \mathcal{U}_{t,t+\delta}$, such that

$$I_\delta(\gamma_t, \beta_1) := \operatorname*{esssup}_{u_1 \in \mathcal{U}_{t,t+\delta}} I_\delta(\gamma_t; u_1, \beta_1(u_1)) = \sup_{i \ge 1} I_\delta(\gamma_t; u_i^1, \beta_1(u_i^1)), \text{ P-a.s.}$$

For any $\varepsilon > 0$, we put $\widetilde{\Gamma}_i := \{I_\delta(\gamma_t, \beta_1) \le I_\delta(\gamma_t; u_i^1, \beta_1(u_i^1)) + \varepsilon\} \in \mathcal{F}_t,\ i \ge 1$. Then $\Gamma_1 := \widetilde{\Gamma}_1,\ \Gamma_i := \widetilde{\Gamma}_i \setminus (\bigcup_{l=1}^{i-1} \widetilde{\Gamma}_l) \in \mathcal{F}_t,\ i \ge 2$, form an $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_t)$-partition, and $u_1^\varepsilon := \sum_{i \ge 1} \mathbf{1}_{\Gamma_i} u_i^1$ belongs obviously to $\mathcal{U}_{t,t+\delta}$. Moreover, from the nonanticipativity of β_1 we have $\beta_1(u_1^\varepsilon) = \sum_{i \ge 1} \mathbf{1}_{\Gamma_i} \beta_1(u_i^1)$, and from the uniqueness of the solution of the fully coupled FBSDE with jumps, we deduce that $I_\delta(\gamma_t; u_1^\varepsilon, \beta_1(u_1^\varepsilon)) = \sum_{i \ge 1} \mathbf{1}_{\Gamma_i} I_\delta(\gamma_t; u_i^1, \beta_1(u_i^1))$, P-a.s. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} W_\delta(\gamma_t) &\le I_\delta(\gamma_t; \beta_1) \le \sum_{i \ge 1} \mathbf{1}_{\Gamma_i} I_\delta(\gamma_t; u_i^1, \beta_1(u_i^1)) + \varepsilon = I_\delta(\gamma_t; u_1^\varepsilon, \beta_1(u_1^\varepsilon)) + \varepsilon \\ &= G^{\gamma_t;u_1^\varepsilon,\beta_1(u_1^\varepsilon)}_{t,t+\delta}[W(X^{\gamma_t;u_1^\varepsilon,\beta_1(u_1^\varepsilon)}_{t+\delta})] + \varepsilon. \end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

On the other hand, using the fact that $\beta_1(\cdot) := \beta(\cdot \oplus u_2) \in \mathcal{B}_{t,t+\delta}$ does not depend on $u_2(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_{t+\delta,T}$, we can define $\beta_2(u_2) := \beta(u_1^\varepsilon \oplus u_2)|_{[t+\delta,T]}$, for all $u_2(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_{t+\delta,T}$. Therefore, from the definition of $W(\gamma_t)$ we have, for any $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$W(\gamma_t) \le \operatorname*{esssup}_{u_2 \in \mathcal{U}_{t+\delta,T}} J(\gamma_t; u_2, \beta_2(u_2)), \text{ P-a.s.}$$

Finally, because there exists a constant $C \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{(i)} \qquad |W(\gamma_t) - W(\bar{\gamma}_t)| \le C\|\gamma_t - \bar{\gamma}_t\| \text{ for any } \gamma_t, \bar{\gamma}_t \in \Lambda; \\ &\text{(ii)} \qquad |J(\gamma_t; u_2, \beta_2(u_2)) - J(\bar{\gamma}_t; u_2, \beta_2(u_2))| \le C\|\gamma_t - \bar{\gamma}_t\|, \text{ P-a.s.} \\ &\qquad\quad \text{for any } u_2 \in \mathcal{U}_{t+\delta,T}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.13}$$

We can show by approximating $X^{\gamma_t;u_1^\varepsilon,\beta_1(u_1^\varepsilon)}_{t+\delta}$ that

$$W(X^{\gamma_t;u_1^\varepsilon,\beta_1(u_1^\varepsilon)}_{t+\delta}) \le \operatorname*{esssup}_{u_2 \in \mathcal{U}_{t+\delta,T}} J(X^{\gamma_t;u_1^\varepsilon,\beta_1(u_1^\varepsilon)}_{t+\delta}; u_2, \beta_2(u_2)), \text{ P-a.s.}$$

To estimate the right side of the later inequality we note that there exists some sequence $\{u_j^2, j \ge 1\} \subset \mathcal{U}_{t+\delta,T}$ such that

$$\operatorname*{esssup}_{u_2 \in \mathcal{U}_{t+\delta,T}} J(X_{t+\delta}^{\gamma_t;u_1^\varepsilon,\beta_1(u_1^\varepsilon)}; u_2, \beta_2(u_2)) = \sup_{j\ge 1} J(X_{t+\delta}^{\gamma_t;u_1^\varepsilon,\beta_1(u_1^\varepsilon)}; u_j^2, \beta_2(u_j^2)),\ \text{P-a.s.}$$

Then, putting $\widetilde{\Delta}_j := \{ \operatorname*{esssup}_{u_2 \in \mathcal{U}_{t+\delta,T}} J(X_{t+\delta}^{\gamma_t;u_1^\varepsilon,\beta_1(u_1^\varepsilon)}; u_2, \beta_2(u_2)) \le J(X_{t+\delta}^{\gamma_t;u_1^\varepsilon,\beta_1(u_1^\varepsilon)}; u_j^2, \beta_2(u_j^2)) + \varepsilon\} \in \mathcal{F}_{t+\delta},\ j \ge 1$; we have with $\Delta_1 := \widetilde{\Delta}_1,\ \Delta_j := \widetilde{\Delta}_j \setminus (\bigcup_{l=1}^{j-1} \widetilde{\Delta}_l) \in \mathcal{F}_{t+\delta},\ j \ge 2$, an $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_{t+\delta})$-partition and $u_2^\varepsilon := \sum_{j\ge1} \mathbf{1}_{\Delta_j} u_j^2 \in \mathcal{U}_{t+\delta,T}$. From the nonanticipativity of β_2 we have $\beta_2(u_2^\varepsilon) = \sum_{j\ge1} \mathbf{1}_{\Delta_j} \beta_2(u_j^2)$, and from the definition of $\beta_1,\ \beta_2$, we know that $\beta(u_1^\varepsilon \oplus u_2^\varepsilon) = \beta_1(u_1^\varepsilon) \oplus \beta_2(u_2^\varepsilon)$. Thus, from the uniqueness of the solution of functional FBSDE, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
J(X_{t+\delta}^{\gamma_t;u_1^\varepsilon,\beta_1(u_1^\varepsilon)}; u_2^\varepsilon, \beta_2(u_2^\varepsilon)) &= Y^{X_{t+\delta}^{\gamma_t;u_1^\varepsilon,\beta_1(u_1^\varepsilon)};u_2^\varepsilon,\beta_2(u_2^\varepsilon)}(t+\delta) \\
&= \sum_{j\ge1} \mathbf{1}_{\Delta_j} Y^{X_{t+\delta}^{\gamma_t;u_1^\varepsilon,\beta_1(u_1^\varepsilon)};u_j^2,\beta_2(u_j^2)}(t+\delta) \\
&= \sum_{j\ge1} \mathbf{1}_{\Delta_j} J(X_{t+\delta}^{\gamma_t;u_1^\varepsilon,\beta_1(u_1^\varepsilon)}; u_j^2, \beta_2(u_j^2)), \quad \text{P-a.s.}
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned}
W(X_{t+\delta}^{\gamma_t;u_1^\varepsilon,\beta_1(u_1^\varepsilon)}) &\le \operatorname*{esssup}_{u_2 \in \mathcal{U}_{t+\delta,T}} J(X_{t+\delta}^{\gamma_t;u_1^\varepsilon,\beta_1(u_1^\varepsilon)}; u_2, \beta_2(u_2)) \\
&\le \sum_{j\ge1} \mathbf{1}_{\Delta_j} J(X_{t+\delta}^{\gamma_t;u_1^\varepsilon,\beta_1(u_1^\varepsilon)}; u_1^\varepsilon \oplus u_j^2, \beta(u_1^\varepsilon \oplus u_j^2)) + \varepsilon \\
&= J(X_{t+\delta}^{\gamma_t;u_1^\varepsilon,\beta_1(u_1^\varepsilon)}; u_1^\varepsilon \oplus u_2^\varepsilon, \beta(u_1^\varepsilon \oplus u_2^\varepsilon)) + \varepsilon \\
&= J(X_{t+\delta}^{\gamma_t;u_1^\varepsilon,\beta_1(u_1^\varepsilon)}; u^\varepsilon, \beta(u^\varepsilon)) + \varepsilon, \quad \text{P-a.s.}
\end{aligned} \tag{4.14}$$

where $u^\varepsilon := u_1^\varepsilon \oplus u_2^\varepsilon \in \mathcal{U}_{t,T}$. From (4.12) and (4.14) and the comparison theorem for BSDEs, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
W_\delta(\gamma_t) &\le G_{t,t+\delta}^{\gamma_t;u_1^\varepsilon,\beta_1(u_1^\varepsilon)}[J(X_{t+\delta}^{\gamma_t;u_1^\varepsilon,\beta_1(u_1^\varepsilon)}; u^\varepsilon, \beta(u^\varepsilon)) + \varepsilon] + \varepsilon \\
&\le G_{t,t+\delta}^{\gamma_t;u_1^\varepsilon,\beta_1(u_1^\varepsilon)}[J(X_{t+\delta}^{\gamma_t;u_1^\varepsilon,\beta_1(u_1^\varepsilon)}; u^\varepsilon, \beta(u^\varepsilon))] + (C+1)\varepsilon \\
&= G_{t,t+\delta}^{\gamma_t;u^\varepsilon,\beta(u^\varepsilon)}[J(X_{t+\delta}^{\gamma_t;u_1^\varepsilon,\beta_1(u_1^\varepsilon)}; u^\varepsilon, \beta(u^\varepsilon))] + (C+1)\varepsilon \\
&= J(\gamma_t; u^\varepsilon, \beta(u^\varepsilon) + (C+1)\varepsilon \\
&= Y^{\gamma_t;u^\varepsilon,\beta(u^\varepsilon)}(t) + (C+1)\varepsilon, \\
&\le \operatorname*{esssup}_{u\in\mathcal{U}_{t,T}} Y^{\gamma_t;u,\beta(u)}(t) + (C+1)\varepsilon \quad \text{P-a.s.}
\end{aligned} \tag{4.15}$$

Since $\beta \in \mathcal{B}_{t,T}$ has been arbitrarily chosen we have (4.15) for all $\beta \in \mathcal{B}_{t,T}$. Therefore,

$$W_\delta(\gamma_t) \le \operatorname*{essinf}_{\beta\in\mathcal{B}_{t,T}} \operatorname*{esssup}_{u\in\mathcal{U}_{t,T}} Y^{\gamma_t;u,\beta(u)}(t) + (C+1)\varepsilon = W(\gamma_t) + (C+1)\varepsilon. \tag{4.16}$$

Finally, letting $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$, we get $W_\delta(\gamma_t) \le W(\gamma_t)$.

□

Lemma 4.7. *$W(\gamma_t) \le W_\delta(\gamma_t)$.*

Proof. We continue to use the notations above, and from the definition of $W_\delta(\gamma_t)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} W_\delta(\gamma_t) &= \operatorname*{essinf}_{\beta_1\in\mathcal{B}_{t,t+\delta}} \operatorname*{esssup}_{u_1\in\mathcal{U}_{t,t+\delta}} G^{\gamma_t;u_1,\beta_1(u_1)}_{t,t+\delta}[W(X^{\gamma_t;u_1,\beta_1(u_1)}_{t+\delta})] \\ &= \operatorname*{essinf}_{\beta_1\in\mathcal{B}_{t,t+\delta}} I_\delta(\gamma_t,\beta_1), \end{aligned} \tag{4.17}$$

and for some sequence $\{\beta^1_i, i\geq 1\}\subset\mathcal{B}_{t,t+\delta}$,

$$W_\delta(\gamma_t) = \inf_{i\geq 1} I_\delta(\gamma_t,\beta^1_i),\ \text{P-a.s.}$$

For any $\varepsilon>0$, we let $\widetilde{\Pi}_i := \{I_\delta(\gamma_t,\beta^1_i)-\varepsilon\leq W_\delta(\gamma_t)\}\in\mathcal{F}_t,\ i\geq 1,\ \Pi_1:=\widetilde{\Pi}_1$ and $\Pi_i := \widetilde{\Pi}_i\backslash(\bigcup_{l=1}^{i-1}\widetilde{\Pi}_l)\in\mathcal{F}_t,\ i\geq 2$. Then, $\{\Pi_i,\ i\geq 1\}$ is an $(\Omega,\mathcal{F}_t)$-partition, $\beta^\varepsilon_1 := \sum_{i\geq 1}\mathbf{1}_{\Lambda_i}\beta^1_i$ belongs to $\mathcal{B}_{t,t+\delta}$, and from the uniqueness of the solution of our functional FBSDE, we conclude that

$$I_\delta(\gamma_t,u_1,\beta^\varepsilon_1(u_1)) = \sum_{i\geq 1}\mathbf{1}_{\Lambda_i}I_\delta(\gamma_t,u_1,\beta^1_i(u_1)),\ \text{P-a.s.},$$

for all $u_1(\cdot)\in\mathcal{U}_{t,t+\delta}$.

$$\begin{aligned} W_\delta(\gamma_t) &\geq \sum_{i\geq 1}\mathbf{1}_{\Pi_i}I_\delta(\gamma_t,\beta^1_i)-\varepsilon \\ &\geq \sum_{i\geq 1}\mathbf{1}_{\Pi_i}I_\delta(\gamma_t,u_1,\beta^1_i(u_1))-\varepsilon \\ &= I_\delta(\gamma_t,u_1,\beta^\varepsilon_1(u_1))-\varepsilon \\ &= G^{\gamma_t,u_1,\beta^\varepsilon_1(u_1)}_{t,t+\delta}[W(X^{\gamma_t;u_1,\beta^\varepsilon_1(u_1)}_{t+\delta})]-\varepsilon,\ \text{P-a.s., for all } u_1\in\mathcal{U}_{t,t+\delta}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.18}$$

On the other hand, from the definition of $W(\gamma_t)$, with the same technique as before, we deduce that, for any $x\in C([0,t+\delta];\mathbb{R}^n)$, there exists $\beta^{x,\varepsilon}\in\mathcal{B}_{t+\delta,T}$ such that

$$W(x_{t+\delta})\geq \operatorname*{esssup}_{u_2\in\mathcal{U}_{t+\delta,T}} J(x_{t+\delta};u_2,\beta^{x,\varepsilon}(u_2))-\varepsilon,\ \text{P-a.s.} \tag{4.19}$$

Let $\{O_i\}_{i\geq 1}$ be a Borel partition of $C([0,t+\delta];\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\operatorname{diam}(O_i)\leq\varepsilon,\ i\geq 1$. Let γ^i be an arbitrarily fixed element of $O_i,\ i\geq 1$. Defining $[X^{\gamma_t;u_1,\beta^\varepsilon_1(u_1)}_{t+\delta}] := \sum_{i\geq 1}\gamma^i_{t+\delta}\mathbf{1}_{\{X^{\gamma_t;u_1,\beta^\varepsilon_1(u_1)}_{t+\delta}\in O_i\}}$, we have

$$|X^{\gamma_t;u_1,\beta^\varepsilon_1(u_1)}_{t+\delta}-[X^{\gamma_t;u_1,\beta^\varepsilon_1(u_1)}_{t+\delta}]|\leq\varepsilon,\ \text{everywhere on } \Omega,\ \text{for all } u_1\in\mathcal{U}_{t,t+\delta}. \tag{4.20}$$

Moreover, for each γ^i, there exists some $\beta^{\gamma^i,\varepsilon}\in\mathcal{B}_{t+\delta,T}$ such that (4.19) holds, and, clearly, $\beta^\varepsilon_{u_1} := \sum_{i\geq 1}\mathbf{1}_{\{X^{\gamma_t;u_1,\beta^\varepsilon_1(u_1)}_{t+\delta}\in O_i\}}\beta^{\gamma^i,\varepsilon}\in\mathcal{B}_{t+\delta,T}$.

Now we can define the new strategy $\beta^\varepsilon(u) := \beta^\varepsilon_1(u_1)\oplus\beta^\varepsilon_{u_1}(u_2),\ u\in\mathcal{U}_{t,T}$, where $u_1 = u|_{[t,t+\delta]},\ u_2 = u|_{(t+\delta,T]}$ (restriction of u to $[t,t+\delta]\times\Omega$ and $(t+\delta,T]\times\Omega$, resp.). Obviously, β^ε maps $\mathcal{U}_{t,T}$ into $\mathcal{V}_{t,T}$. Moreover, β^ε is nonanticipating: Indeed, let $S:\Omega\to[t,T]$ be an $\mathbb{F}$-stopping time and $u,\ u'\in\mathcal{U}_{t,T}$ be such that $u\equiv u'$ on $[[t,S]]$. Decomposing $u,\ u'$ into $u_1,\ u_1'\in\mathcal{U}_{t,t+\delta},\ u_2,\ u_2'\in\mathcal{U}_{t+\delta,T}$ such that $u = u_1\oplus u_1'$ and $u = u_2\oplus u_2'$. We have $u_1\equiv u_1'$ on $[[t,S\wedge(t+\delta)]]$ from which we get $\beta^\varepsilon_1(u_1) = \beta^\varepsilon_1(u_1')$ on $[[t,S\wedge(t+\delta)]]$ (recall that β^ε_1 is nonanticipating). On the other hand, $u_2\equiv u_2'$ on $[[t+\delta,S\vee(t+\delta)]](\subset(t+\delta,T]\times S>t+\delta)$, and on $S>t+\delta$ we have $X^{\gamma_t;u_1,\beta^\varepsilon_1(u_1)}_{t+\delta} = X^{\gamma_t;u_1',\beta^\varepsilon_1(u_1')}_{t+\delta}$. Consequently, from our definition, $\beta^\varepsilon_{u_1} = \beta^\varepsilon_{u_1'}$ on $\{S>t+\delta\}$ and $\beta^\varepsilon_{u_1}(u_2) = \beta^\varepsilon_{u_1'}(u_2')$ on $]]t+\delta,S\vee(t+\delta)]]$. This yields $\beta^\varepsilon(u) = \beta^\varepsilon_1(u_1)\oplus\beta^\varepsilon_{u_1}(u_2) = \beta^\varepsilon_1(u_1')\oplus\beta^\varepsilon_{u_1'}(u_2')$ on $[[t,S]]$, from which it follows that $\beta^\varepsilon\in\mathcal{B}_{t,T}$.

Let now $u \in \mathcal{U}_{t,T}$ be arbitrarily chosen and decomposed into $u_1 = u|_{(t,t+\delta]} \in \mathcal{U}_{t,t+\delta}$, and $u_2 = u|_{[t+\delta,T]} \in \mathcal{U}_{t+\delta,T}$. Then from (4.18), (4.13)-(i), (4.20) and the comparison theorem, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} W_\delta(\gamma_t) &\geq G^{\gamma_t;u_1,\beta_1^\varepsilon(u_1)}_{t,t+\delta}[W(X^{\gamma_t;u_1,\beta_1^\varepsilon(u_1)}_{t+\delta})] - \varepsilon \\ &\geq G^{\gamma_t;u_1,\beta_1^\varepsilon(u_1)}_{t,t+\delta}[W([X^{\gamma_t;u_1,\beta_1^\varepsilon(u_1)}_{t+\delta}]) - C\varepsilon] - \varepsilon \\ &\geq G^{\gamma_t;u_1,\beta_1^\varepsilon(u_1)}_{t,t+\delta}[W([X^{\gamma_t;u_1,\beta_1^\varepsilon(u_1)}_{t+\delta}])] - C\varepsilon \\ &= G^{\gamma_t;u_1,\beta_1^\varepsilon(u_1)}_{t,t+\delta}[\sum_{i\geq 1} \mathbf{1}_{\{X^{\gamma_t;u_1,\beta_1^\varepsilon(u_1)}_{t+\delta} \in O_i\}} W(\gamma^i_{t+\delta})] - C\varepsilon, \quad \text{P-a.s.} \end{aligned} \tag{4.21}$$

Furthermore, from (4.21), (4.13)-(ii), (4.19) and the comparison theorem, we have

$$\begin{aligned} W_\delta(\gamma_t) &\geq G^{\gamma_t;u_1,\beta_1^\varepsilon(u_1)}_{t,t+\delta}[\sum_{i\geq 1} \mathbf{1}_{\{X^{\gamma_t;u_1,\beta_1^\varepsilon(u_1)}_{t+\delta} \in O_i\}} J(\gamma^i_{t+\delta}; u_2, \beta^{\gamma^i,\varepsilon}(u_2)) - \varepsilon] - C\varepsilon \\ &\geq G^{\gamma_t;u_1,\beta_1^\varepsilon(u_1)}_{t,t+\delta}[\sum_{i\geq 1} \mathbf{1}_{\{X^{\gamma_t;u_1,\beta_1^\varepsilon(u_1)}_{t+\delta} \in O_i\}} J(\gamma^i_{t+\delta}; u_2, \beta^{\gamma^i,\varepsilon}(u_2))] - C\varepsilon \\ &= G^{\gamma_t;u_1,\beta_1^\varepsilon(u_1)}_{t,t+\delta}[J([X^{\gamma_t;u_1,\beta_1^\varepsilon(u_1)}_{t+\delta}]; u_2, \beta^\varepsilon_{u_1}(u_2))] - C\varepsilon \\ &\geq G^{\gamma_t;u_1,\beta_1^\varepsilon(u_1)}_{t,t+\delta}[J(X^{\gamma_t;u_1,\beta_1^\varepsilon(u_1)}_{t+\delta}; u_2, \beta^\varepsilon_{u_1}(u_2)) - C\varepsilon] - C\varepsilon \\ &\geq G^{\gamma_t;u_1,\beta_1^\varepsilon(u_1)}_{t,t+\delta}[J(X^{\gamma_t;u_1,\beta_1^\varepsilon(u_1)}_{t+\delta}; u_2, \beta^\varepsilon_{u_1}(u_2))] - C\varepsilon \\ &= G^{\gamma_t;u,\beta^\varepsilon(u)}_{t,t+\delta}[Y^{\gamma_t;u,\beta^\varepsilon(u)}(t+\delta)] - C\varepsilon \\ &= Y^{\gamma_t;u,\beta^\varepsilon(u)}(t) - C\varepsilon, \quad \text{P-a.s.,} \quad \text{for any } u \in \mathcal{U}_{t,T}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.22}$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} W_\delta(\gamma_t) &\geq \operatorname*{esssup}_{u \in \mathcal{U}_{t,T}} J(\gamma_t; u, \beta^\varepsilon(u)) - C\varepsilon \\ &\geq \operatorname*{essinf}_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}_{t,T}} \operatorname*{esssup}_{u \in \mathcal{U}_{t,T}} J(\gamma_t; u, \beta(u)) - C\varepsilon \\ &= W(\gamma_t) - C\varepsilon, \quad \text{P-a.s.} \end{aligned} \tag{4.23}$$

Finally, letting $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ we get $W_\delta(\gamma_t) \geq W(\gamma_t)$.

□

Remark 4.1. (a) (i) *For every* $\beta \in \mathcal{B}_{t,t+\delta}$, *there exists some* $u^\varepsilon(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_{t,t+\delta}$ *such that*

$$W(\gamma_t)(= W_\delta(\gamma_t)) \leq G^{\gamma_t;u^\varepsilon,\beta(u^\varepsilon)}_{t,t+\delta}[W(X^{\gamma_t;u^\varepsilon,\beta(u^\varepsilon)}_{t+\delta})] + \varepsilon, \quad P\text{-a.s.} \tag{4.24}$$

(ii) *There exists some* $\beta^\varepsilon(\cdot) \in \mathcal{B}_{t,t+\delta}$ *such that, for all* $u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_{t,t+\delta}$

$$W(\gamma_t)(= W_\delta(\gamma_t)) \geq G^{\gamma_t;u^\varepsilon,\beta^\varepsilon(u)}_{t,t+\delta}[W(X^{\gamma_t;u,\beta^\varepsilon(u)}_{t+\delta})] - \varepsilon, \quad P\text{-a.s.} \tag{4.25}$$

(b) *From Proposition 3.1, we know the lower value function* W *is deterministic. So, by choosing* $\delta = T - t$ *and taking expectation on both sides of (4.24), (4.25), we get* $W(\gamma_t) = \inf_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}_{t,T}} \sup_{u \in \mathcal{U}_{t,T}} E[J(\gamma_t; u, \beta(u))]$.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 11171187, No. 10871118 and No. 10921101); supported by the Programme of Introducing Talents of Discipline to Universities of China (No. B12023); supported by Program for New Century Excellent Talents in University of China.

References

[1] BUCKDAHN, R. and LI, J. (2008) *Stochastic differential games and viscosity solution of Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman-Isaacs equation,* SIAM J. Control, Optim. 47, 444-475.

[2] CONT R. and FOURNIÉ D. A. (2010) *A functional extension of the Itô's formula,* C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris 348, no. 1-2, 57-61.

[3] CONT R. and FOURNIÉ D. A. (2010) *Change of variables formulas for non-anticipative functionals on path space,* J. Funct. Anal. 259, no. 4, 1043-1072.

[4] CONT R. and FOURNIÉ D. A. (2010) *Functional Itô's calculus and stochastic integral representation of martingales,* arxiv.org/abs/1002.2446.

[5] CRANDALL, M.G., ISHII, H. and LIONS, P.L. (1992) *User's guide to viscosity solutions of second order partial differential equations,* Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 27, 1-67.

[6] DUFFIE D. and Epstein L., (1992) *Stochastic differential utility,* Econometrica, 60, 353ÍC 394.

[7] DUPIRE B., Functional Itô's calculus, Portfolio Research Paper, Bloomberg, 2009.

[8] EKREN I., KELLER C., TOUZI N. and ZHANG J. (2011) *On Viscosity Solutions of Path Dependent PDEs*, to appear in Annals of Probability (arXiv:1109.5971).

[9] FLEMING W.H. and METE SONER H., *Control Markov processes and Viscosity Solutions,* New York: Springer Verlag

[10] HAMADENE S. and LEPELTIER J. P. (1995) *Zero-sum stochastic differential games and backward equations,* Systems Control Lett. 24, 259-263.

[11] HAMADENE S., LEPELTIER J. P.. and PENG, S.G. (1997) *BSDEs with continuous coefficients and stochastic differential games,* Stochastic Differential Equations, Pitman Research Notes in Math. Series, No.364, El Karoui Mazliak edit, 115-128.

[12] El KAROUI, N., PENG, S.G. and QUENEZ, M. C. (1997) *Backward stochastic differential equations in finance*, Math. Finance 7, 1-71.

[13] Ji, S.L. and Yang, S.Z. (2012) *An optimal control problem for functional forward-backward stochastic systems and related Path-dependent HJB equations,* arxiv.org/abs/1204.6543.

[14] PARDOUX, E. and PENG, S.G. (1990) *Adapted solution of a backward stochastic differential equation,* Systems Control Lett. 14, No.1-2, 55-61.

[15] PARDOUX, E. and PENG, S.G. (1992) *Backward stochastic differential equations and quasilinear parabolic partial differential equations. Stochastic partial differential equations and their applications,* Proc. IFIP Int. Conf., Charlotte/NC (USA) 1991, Lect. Notes Control Inf. Sci. 176, 200-217.

[16] PARDOUX, E. and TANG, S.J. (1999) *Forward-backward stochastic differential equations and quasilinear parabolic PDEs,* Prob. Theory Relat. Fields 114, 123-150.

[17] PENG, S.G. (1990) *A general stochastic maximum principle for optimal control problems,* SIAM J. Control Optim. 28, 966-979.

[18] PENG, S.G. (1991) *Probabilistic interpretation for systems of quasilinear parabolic partial differential equation,* Stochastic Reports 37, 61-74.

[19] PENG, S.G. (1992) *A generalized dynamic programming principle and Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation,* Stochastics and Stochastics Reports. 38, 119-134.

[20] PENG, S.G. (1997) *Backward stochastic differential equations-stochastic optimization theory and viscosity solutions of HJB equations, in Topics on stochastic analysis,* YAN, J.A., PENG, S.G., FANG, S.Z. and WU, L.M. Ch.2, Science Press. Beijing. 85-138 (in Chinese).

[21] PENG, S.G. *Note on Viscosity Solution of Path-Dependent PDE and G-Martingales,* arxiv.org/abs/1106.1144v1.

[22] PENG, S.G. and WANG F.L. (2011) *BSDE, Path-dependent PDE and Nonlinear Feynman-Kac Formula,* arxiv.org/abs/1108.4317.

[23] WU, Z. and YU, Z.Y. (2008) *Dynamic programming principle for one kind of stochastic recursive optimal control problem and Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation,* SIAM J. CONTROL OPTIM. 47(5), 2616-2641.

[24] YONG J. and ZHOU X.Y. *Stochastic controls: Hamiltonian systems and HJB equations.* Springer-Verlag, New York (1999).